UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Special!

A SERIES OF ARTICLES BY

EDWARD HOLTON JAMES

BEGINNING IN THIS ISSUE

◆ ◆ ◆

A Free American Looks at India

I. Gandhi.
II. Nationalism and Internationalism.
III. Democracy and Caste
IV. An Incident
V. A Lesson in Economics
VI. Lions—and Rabbits
VII. Princes and Native States
VIII. Cow-Worship and Sex
IX. An Interview with Annie Besant.

VOLUME CVII NUMBER 6

Chicago, April 6, 1931

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA NAGELEY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
CHARLES E. BEALS
PERCY M. DAWSON
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
WALTER WALSH
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
ITALY—DOROTHY WALTON
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 83

Building Anew a Shattered Culture—ALSON H. ROBINSON 85

Jottings—J. H. H. 86

ARTICLES—

Booms and Panics—*Joannis van Loon* 83

Einstein, Eddington and Jeans: Is Science Vindicating Religion (*Concluded*)—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 87

A Free American Looks at India—I Gandhi—EDWARD HOLTON JAMES 90

Thoughts of Tolstoy—Part XXI 92

POETRY—

Song of Friendship—CHARLOTTE CONKRIGHT KINNEY 91

Waste of War—MARTHA LINSLEY SPENCER 91

THE STUDY TABLE—

An Able Work in India—TARAKNATH DAS 93

CORRESPONDENCE—

Is Wealth Sharing Unemployment Burden—F. S. KINDER 95

THE FIELD—

The Seminar in Mexico—HUBERT C. HERRING 82

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Seminar in Mexico

A Co-operative Study of Mexican Life and Culture

Sixth Session, Mexico City, July 4-24, 1931

The Committee on Cultural Relations With Latin America

John Dewey, Honorary Chairman.
Edward Alsworth Ross, Chairman.
Florence E. Allen, Vice-Chairman.
Henry Goddard Leach, Vice-Chairman.
Frederic Siedenburg, Vice-Chairman.
Walter Frank, Treasurer.
Hubert C. Herring, Executive Director.

One Hundred Twelve East Nineteenth Street, New York

"The Seminar in Mexico" is a venture in international understanding. It is a cooperative study of the life and culture of the Mexican people. During the past five years over four hundred men and women, widely representative of many public groups of the United States, have, through the Seminar, met influential Mexican citizens for a discussion of the living forces in Mexican life — cultural, educational, economic.

"The Seminar in Mexico" was launched six years ago as an agency for developing public opinion throughout the United States, making it sensitive to the peculiar genius of the Mexican, appreciative of his artistic and cultural gifts, and concerned with the creation of relations of mutual respect between the peoples of the two republics. The annual program has grown from year to year in significance and interest. Among those who attest the reality of its contribution towards the improvement of our relations with Mexico are Dr. John Dewey, Dr. Henry Goddard Leach, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Dr. John A. Lapp, President Ada Comstock, Mr. Paul U. Kellogg, Judge Florence E. Allen, Dr. Raymond L. Buell, and Father Frederic Siedenburg.

Our relations with Latin America are of fundamental importance, ethically, commercially, culturally. During the next twenty-five years it will be decided whether the peoples of the Americas are to live together in mutual respect and cooperation, or in suspicion and recurrent strife. Mexico furnishes the touchstone whereby our relations to Latin America are to be tested. Mexico is our next neighbor. If our relations with Mexico can be firmly established upon a basis of mutual appreciation and respect, we shall have gone far toward establishing the enduring peace of the Americas.

The Committee announces the Sixth Annual Session of the Seminar in

(*Continued on page* 96)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

VOLUME CVII MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1931 NUMBER 6

BOOMS AND PANICS

"When a whole nation goes mad, no matter for what cause, it is useless to try to reason about it. In God's good time order will be reestablished, a few people will have made a lot of money, many more will have lost all they had, and everything will be as it was before until the next outbreak of wholesale lunacy."

—*Joannis van Loon,*
when (1637) the collapse of the tulip boom ruined Holland.

On March 21st last, the New York *Times* published the following despatch from India:

A large group of American tourists from the steamer Belgenland tonight cheered lustily for Mahatma Gandhi in the midst of his regular open-air prayers. Later, they beseiged him for autographs and photographs.

Scarcely had the prayers ended when the bolder of the visitors stormed the unperturbed leader for autographs and photographs. This led to a lively bit of repartee.

"You might as well ask me for a lock of my hair," Mr. Gandhi replied. "I haven't any."

There was a roar of laughter as the Americans regarded his hairless head.

"When are you coming to America? They will go wild about you over there," said Mrs. Hattie Belle Johnston of New York.

"After India has her independence," Mr. Gandhi replied.

"How long will that take?"

"Oh, perhaps not so long as it took America to get her freedom," was the Mahatma's quick reply.

As the Mahatma disappeared into his tent the Americans gave him another rousing cheer and voted him a "good fellow."

This shows American tourists at their best—or rather their worst! It is difficult to find words adequate to describe as it should be described this utterly vulgar, discourteous, indecent, and yet thoroughly characteristic performance. Here is a man who is a devout saint engaged in the prayers which are sacred to him and to his followers, and he is assaulted by the lusty cheers of a group of American travelers. What would we think of a crowd of Hindus who might come breaking in upon a silent and solemn church service in this country on a Sunday morning and cheer the minister? Then note that this great man, beset by problems greater than those borne by any other leader in the world today, is beseiged for autographs and photographs, as though he were a peddler with wares to be distributed to all bidders. Then see this gang of Yankee hoodlums greeting this revered Mahatma with the highest honor of which the American mind can conceive—namely, "good fellow." If Sinclair Lewis had invented this scene of perfect Babbittry, he could not have made it worse. And it is people of this disgusting type who journey around the world and advertise our native land! Nothing saved this situation but Gandhi himself. Note in the story his unperturbed good nature and his perfect courtesy. It is to such "heathen" that we send missionaries, to convert them to Christianity!

The shifts in the international field are like the shifts from sunshine to rain on an April day. For a long time, now, the world has been shadowed by heavy clouds of darkness. Storm has swept down upon us in the revolt in India, the widespread industrial depression, and the continued race of armaments. Now, all of a sudden, the clouds have lifted, and we see patches of blue sky for at least a moment. In India, for example, there is a blessed truce which promises under the determined but still benign leadership of Gandhi to become an enduring peace. In Europe, an accord between Italy and France has been unexpectedly reached under which the race of arms will be limited if not ended. In America, the President is arranging to withdraw the marines from Nicaragua and to make final settlements in Haiti. Of course, these pleasant prospects may not long remain with us. The situation in India may at any time reach an impasse, since Gandhi has no intention of reliquishing his ultimate objective. In Europe there still remain numerous centers of disturbance, notably Germany, while the economic situation gets steadily worse. In Latin America, the atmosphere is sultry with revolution. But just at present the sun is shining through rifts in the clouds and lighting up the landscape here and there. We have a right to be a bit optimistic as we leave our umbrellas in expectation of a pleasant day. There are potent forces in the world that are making for war, but there are also potent forces that are making for peace. It is still "a race between education and catastrophe," to use Wells's famous words, but the catastrophe has not yet come, while the education is steadily going on. Let us hope—but also work with the more vigor and courage just because we are hoping.

It is idle to speculate as to whether New York or Chicago has the more disgraceful city administration at the present time. Personally we think Chicago is the more noisy, vulgar and violent, while New

York is the more sordid, depraved and sheer indecent. The brutish figure of Mayor Thompson as contrasted with the dapper elegance of Mayor Walker tells the story. But at bottom the governments of these two greatest cities in the country are so rotten as to defy comparison, except perhaps with the governments of Boston and Philadelphia. In one respect, however, New York is better off than any other of these cities. We refer to the fact that, under the laws of the State of New York, the mayor of the metropolis may be removed under charges, or arbitrarily, and without appeal, by order of the governor. This is the explanation of the formal demand upon Governor Roosevelt to remove Mayor Walker from the office which he has misused and disgraced. Let Chicago citizens, who are sweating under the rule of Mayor Thompson, imagine what it would mean to have such a law as this in Illinois, and we know that they will envy their New York contemporaries. What Governor Roosevelt will do with the charges submitted against the mayor will be known before this editorial appears in print. Whether he acts or not, the mere existence of the law has made it possible to indict the mayor, and thus to accelerate and guide a movement which will not end until New York is cleansed of its political abominations. One thing is certain, and that is that Mayor Walker, whether ousted now or not, has reached the end of his political career, as he has exhausted the patience of his fellow-citizens. Sooner or later this playboy will go where he belongs—to the moving picture colony in Hollywood, where he can wise-crack, grimace and have his gay good times to his heart's content.

Wonderful, *wonderful,* is Calvin Coolidge's comment on the income tax returns. "Returns made in 1930," he writes, "reveal incomes that are beyond human comprehension." Like the war debts, for example! The total is over $141,000,000,000 gross, and $35,000,000,000 net. This was received by 4,000,000 individuals and 500,000 corporations. But why by only 4,000,000 individuals? What about the 36,000,000 individuals who made no returns? These persons were all "gainfully employed," Mr. Coolidge concedes, and yet they did not earn enough money from their employment to make any tax payment to the government. Worse still, "more than one-half the net individual income is supplied by persons who have less than $2,000 annually." Yet Mr. Coolidge passes right on to the amazing conclusion that "the people still own this country!" How much of it is owned by the man who earns $2,000 a year? How much is owned by the millions of persons who toil early and late, and yet do not have money enough to rank them among the income tax payers of the nation? The United States is wealthy, of course. Its annual productive income is indeed enormous. But where does this income go? To whom is it distributed? To the producers, the workers? Not at all—these get but a mere bagatelle. The great mass of wealth produced pours into the hands of a comparatively few men and women, whose distinguishing characteristic is that they are not workers at all but owners. All that Calvin Coolidge says about these income tax figures is rightly an occasion not for satisfaction, but for utter discontent and outrage. The people who labor and thus produce the enormous incomes which so stir the enthusiasm of our ex-President are a disinherited class. They will never really "own this country," as they should, until they receive all, and not merely a fragmentary part, of what they earn.

Are there to be no standards left? How can there be, when we are breeding and rearing a generation which knows nothing of those masterworks by which our standards have been established? We marvel at the books which men and women are not only reading today but actually describing as works of genius. But why marvel, when these men and women have never read a word of Thackeray or Hawthorne, and have never even heard of Fielding or Jane Austen? We stand horrified at the public's easy acceptance of, even barbaric delight in the jazz music which is now turning our concert-halls as well as our dance-halls into savage jungles. But why be surprised when we live in the midst of multitudes who never heard a Bach fugue, a Mozart sonata, or a Beethoven symphony? We mourn at the condition of our theatre. But we begin to understand, when the dramatic critic of a great New York newspaper, in a review of the "Merchant of Venice," confesses that he has never seen Irving as Shylock, and shows unwittingly that he has never even read the text of the play. A few weeks ago we asserted in these columns, on the basis of specific evidence, that our young men and women today, college-bred as well as high-school fed, are cultural illiterates. They can read and write, in a fashion, but know nothing that makes what Bacon called "the full man." They do not even know good manners, or the ethics of conduct. As for religion, they are as pagan as the wild man of Borneo. And there is nobody to blame but ourselves! Knowing what standards are, we have not cared enough about them to transmit them to our successors. Believing in education, and spending millions to build schools unparalleled in history, we have been zealous in teaching everything except the things really worth knowing. Macauley surmised that, whereas former civilizations were destroyed by barbarians from beyond the frontiers, our civilization was destined to be destroyed by barbarians bred from within. Well, the breeding process is going on! The barbarians are appearing!

Spring is coming, and then summer—which means that it is time to begin thinking of what we are going

to do about noise! This horror used to be confined to our great cities, where it rages today like a pestilence amid the seething masses of our heaped-up populations. In New York, recently, the numerous residents of an entire apartment house came rushing into court over a combat in noise between two irate families. One family had a son who thought he was a singer and, said his neighbor, "had been singing the same scale for four months and flated on the same note every time." Incensed beyond endurance, this neighbor had constructed a noise-machine to drown out the singer. Asked to describe this machine, the elevator-man testified that it looked like a lot of automobile horns on a phonograph, and "sounded like the house was tumbling down, like somebody was dying somewhere in the woods, like sixty-five truck drivers." This was just one case of frayed nerves, of which there are thousands in our big cities, and will be thousands more this coming summer. But we expect this din and clamor where too many people are occupying the same space at the same time. What is new is the invasion of the open countryside —the seashore, the mountains, the farms—by the curse of noise. Where are we going to get away from the automobile, with its roaring engine and raucous horn? With flying-machines multiplying overhead, what peace is there going to be in the skies either day or night? As for the radio, sending out its penetrating whine over hill and valley as well as city street, what escape is possible? We can see the cure coming when deafness will be a blessing. Or will we breed a race of humans who no more mind the noises of our civilization than sea-gulls mind the roaring of the waves? One thing is certain—that the present generation is unadapted to the dreadful din of our days, and therefore suffers as no other generation has ever suffered in history.

Building Anew a Shattered Culture

The birds are coming back from the South. Not only the robins and wrens, but those varieties that fly North with bags of golf clubs flapping from their shoulders. It is reported not to have been a very good season. You couldn't spend so much time in the ocean as you would like; and when it rained it was embarrassing to come back to the parking place with so few par shots and holes in two.

Forgetting for the moment the bathing and golf and weather, if you happen to ask one of these birds something about the Southern people whom they have met the answer is not without significance. "We haven't met any," they tell you. "That wasn't what we went for. It's all right for Professor Whitehead to talk about the value of travel as showing us things in unusual combinations; but we don't like our things too unusual." In spite of this judgment from the majority of migrants, here and there, if you are patient, you will find those to whom a Southern trip has been a cultural and human experience, as well as recreational.

Some four or five years ago Mr. Claude Bowers, editorial writer for the late and deeply lamented New York *World* wrote a book concerning the revolution following the administration and death of Lincoln, entitled "The Tragic Era." A lot of persons familiar with the sweep of human experience might suggest that Mr. Bowers use that same title and apply it with equal, perhaps greater fitness to the revolution following the administration of Calvin Coolidge, that is to say, to this present moment.

Whether then or now, the marks of tragedy are still visible upon vast areas of an otherwise lovely landscape, upon the walls of homes and public buildings, and upon the faces of the people themselves. And back of it all looms the grim and stark fact that the South is still struggling to get back upon its feet as a result of the civil war, and the equally disastrous effects of the pestilential army of carpet baggers.

If you had to build up a new culture where would you begin? It sounds like an academic question, or one which may apply only to the British in India, or to the Indians as they turn to the control of their own destinies. It may be an academic question with us for the moment, but if things keep on the next generation all over the nation may find themselves faced with a task of rebuilding a shattered culture analogous to that with which our own South has been confronted for fifty years. When some of the political leaders of the South announced that with the next election they would go back horse, foot and dragoon to the good old Democratic party of their grandfathers and that this little excursion which they had made into the sanctities of the Republican party was enough for them, this may have been an echo of that task which still confronts them—the task of reconstruction, which is never complete.

One of the first things that an observing visitor discovers is that even the influential people of the South have difficulty in telling the black people from the white. Of course nobody would admit it; but the confusion is one which they have acquired quite honestly. There is an incident in "Po Buckra," a novel of the South by two writers who ought to know, to the effect that John Ash and his family were socially classed as whites, while his cousin, Peter and his family, were barred as colored. Yet between them there was no gulf fixed. The explanation of it is that before

the Confederate war—as they call it—grandfathers of these men were classed as free persons of color. Congress refused to let that class of persons be conscripted like white men, so South Carolina took her own course and raised a regiment of volunteers from them. John's grandfather, Jim Ash, enlisted, Peter's didn't. When the war was over the gentlemen of the section decided that men who had served under their old flag should be treated as white, regardless of their previous status. So from their grandfathers, John is white, Peter colored. Back of that they are both colored. What color they may be a few generations hence nobody can tell.

When we think of the South we think in terms of agricultural economy, rice and cotton plantations, and of the labor of slaves by which alone this economy could be carried on under its original conditions. Now all that is gone; the rice fields are flooded, and where once the cotton fields were flourishing there is the happy promise of green peas within a fortnight for the tables of the Northern Epicurean.

It takes a long time to transfer culture from that of an agricultural to, let us say, an industrial economy. So far as industry is concerned, if one may judge from the horrors of Gastonia, they have started in with the worst instead of the best whatever that may be, which is associated with modern industry. Under an agricultural economy you develop a certain culture, a certain state of mind. Why is it that the rural districts of New England for example are different from the urban centers? The people are the same, same color, same human reactions, same ambitions. Contact with the earth, the sort of contacts which were developed upon the great plantations, the genial mildness of a climate which enables you to live out doors for the greater part of the year—develop all these, a certain attitude towards life, and a certain peculiar culture. When you take that away life becomes different. The South has never been restored to the state of mind which formerly obtained, and it never will. Here is a great territory being transformed, literally from the ground up.

Another task which confronts the builders of the New South is that of the preservation and restoration of an architecture, partly indigenous, partly borrowed, but admittedly beautiful. Whenever men erect houses, or churches or public buildings they offer to the world tangible symbols of their own hidden aspirations. Such symbols serve two motives, one of use the other the expression of man's esthetic sense. As one moves about among the imposing houses and public buildings of such a city as Charleston, S. C., he realizes that from an architectural point of view it is possible to project himself into the golden age of Colonial building. What is going to happen to these splendid buildings, everywhere showing signs of decay? How are these crumbling walls to be built up again? One method is to encourage the introduction of industry whereby capital may be secured for the task of building anew. But some of these old towns are most reluctant to admit the roar of modern machinery, and industry of the sort that will turn the trick seldom accepts grudging hospitality. The other device lies in the purchase of some of these fine old houses and plantations by affluent Northerners, a tendency of which there is already ample evidence.

Mr. DuBose Heyward in some of his appealing lines embodying the chant of an old town asks what reply such a place can make to the question as to why these old towns should survive.

> And in answer
> You smile your faded wistful smile,
> And show us a crooked moss-hung tree
> A century old;
> And the way a street
> Bends a protecting arm
> About an impossible curve.

The best that we can hope for is that when the inevitable mingling of races, and economy, and architecture of the new age makes its appearance, as it has already done, it will mingle the beauty of the old with the beauty of the new—that men may love it, and call it home.

ALSON H. ROBINSON.

Jottings

"The business depression has passed the bottom," says a great expert. Yes, "passed the bottom," and gone right straight down to unsuspected depths of demoralization and woe.

Rabbi Albert G. Minda selects as the five greatest Jews today the following: Einstein, Judge Brandeis, Salmon O. Levinson, Nathan Straus (dead, but "still regarded among the living"), and Henrietta Szold.—Amen, especially to Salmon O. Levinson! But we would recognize Nathan Straus's death, and put Stephen S. Wise in his stead.

A school-boy declares that the national motto in the French Revolution was "Liberty, Equality, Maternity."—Well, he wasn't so far wrong! Maternity is certainly the watchword of France today if not yesterday.

An English auto-racer, who broke all speed records on the sands of Florida, was recently made a knight. Does this mean that if an English prize-fighter came over here and won the heavyweight championship, he would be made an earl or a duke?

Speaking of automobile races on Florida sands —would it be correct to call these sands "the sands of time?"

It would seem as though we had come to something like a turning-point in our national history when more emigrants leave the country each month than immigrants come in. The tide has now turned—and this means something more than a mere matter of restrictive legislation! J. H. H.

Einstein, Eddington and Jeans: Is Science Vindicating Religion?

II

So much for Einstein, great scientist, profound religionist! All of which is an introduction to what I want to say this morning about the relations between science and religion in our time! As I consider these relations, they seem to have passed through three distinct periods of development, or rather to have passed through two such periods, and now to be emerging into a third.

In the beginning— i. e., at the opening of modern times—and down through at least the first half of the nineteenth century, science and religion were in open warfare with one another. The conflict turned upon questions of fact—the age of the earth, its place in the solar system, the structure of the heavens, the evolution of species, the nature of man, the rule of law. It is to be remembered that, for a thousand years before the Renaissance, there had been no science in our western world. The Greeks had a highly developed science, but it all disappeared with the collapse of the Roman Empire, and was as completely forgotten as though it had never been. In its place came theology, a Christian theory of origin and destiny which was based not upon observation and experimentation but upon certain preconceived doctrines of revelation. The theology of the Middle Ages, in other words, was all based upon the Bible, and constituted therefore an attempt to explain the world in terms of the Biblical cosmology. When science came along, it was inevitable that there should be dispute between science and religion, for science, with its careful and systematic study of the physical universe, discovered facts altogether inconsistent with the doctrines of the church. Thus, the earth was much older than had ever been imagined; this earth was not the center of the universe, but an insignificant planet in a remote corner of the heavens; this universe was not a series of concentric spheres, but a vast, illimitable range of stellar space; there had never been a creation, but only an evolution, of organic forms; man was not divine in his origin, but the offspring of the animals which had preceded him upon this planet; there were no miracles, or divine interventions in the world, but only one unbroken realm of law and order. These were some of the new facts which science submitted to the judgment of men, and which religion denounced as heresies, blasphemies, illusions. But in every dispute of this kind between science and religion, from the first discoveries of Copernicus to the latest speculations of Einstein, science has been triumphant over religion. In this conflict over the facts of the physical order of the world, religion has always and everywhere been defeated. The victory of science over the so-called revelation of the church has been the most sweeping in the whole history of the human mind.

There are many persons who believe that this victory of science has meant the end of religion—and great has been the joy of the atheists and free-thinkers! As a matter of fact, however, religion has not been touched at all. For religion, in its true estate, has nothing to do with questions of fact in the outer world of the physical senses. In the absence of any science which could give a knowledge of the facts, religion developed, as we have seen, a system of theology which it offered as a statement of reality, and with which it was so foolish as to identify its own destiny. When science was revived, it was inevitable that there should be conflict between a theology which pretended to describe facts upon a basis of revelation, and a science which undertook to discover facts upon a basis of research. It was this conflict which Dr. Andrew D. White took pains to define with exact precision when he entitled his famous book upon the subject, "A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology." It was theology which science was fighting—and destroying. But theology is not religion. It cannot be identified with religion, no matter how definitely religion itself may insist upon the identification. Theology is only what men think about religion, or what they think about the world from the standpoint of religion. And theologies may come and go, as they have come and gone since the beginning of man's conscious thought, but religion remains what Einstein himself has called it—man's "cosmic sense" of the "totality of existence." The victory of science, therefore, in the first period of development in our times, is a victory over theology, and a challenge to religion to work out a new theology in terms not of ancient tradition but of modern knowledge.

No sooner was this conflict decided in favor of science as against theology, than there developed a new conflict which this time involved religion itself. This conflict occupied the second period in our history of the relations between science and religion, and had to do not with facts but with the meaning of facts. In other words, the interpretation of reality! Religion, of course, has always insisted, as a condition of its own existence as something real and not illusory, that the fundamental interpretation of the universe is spiritual. It has seen the world as life, and this life as manifesting intellectual and moral qualities which reach their fulfilment in the soul of man. It has attributed this life, in all its range from star-dust to breathing organism, to a divine origin in God, and in this God has found that ultimate reality of spirit in which all things "live and move and have their being." But the science of the last century would have nothing to do with this! As science looked at the universe, through its microscopes and telescopes, it saw no evidence of spirit. On the contrary, it saw phenomena so completely physical as to eliminate altogether the spiritual hypothesis. Here was matter, the substance of the

world—the hard, impenetrable raw material out of which everything was made. And this matter was indestructible! Here, in the second place, was force—the energy which gave motion to the world, and thus created the reality which we know as life. And this force was inexhaustible! Lastly, there was law, the reign of law, which tied everything together in a uniform and universal chain of cause and effect. And this law was immutable! Matter, motion, law—these were the constituent elements of the world! And they left no room, or seemed to leave no room, for spirit. It was on this issue, which had to do with the uttermost reality of things, that religion and science joined in their second great battle for supremacy. And in this battle over interpretation, exactly as in the first battle over facts, science seemed to be everywhere triumphant. This universe is made not of spirit but of matter. Its processes are not fundamentally intellectual or spiritual, but mechanical. The picture of the world is not that of a person but of a mechanism. What we have here, in this stupendous collection of elements, is a piece of complex physical machinery—colossal in its proportions, infinite in its complications, incomprehensible in its significations, but in essence a machine, like a gasoline engine or a dynamo. Science, in other words, is materialistic. Its mechanistic philosophy has put an end to the spiritual vagaries of religion.

It was with this equipment that science came bursting like a conqueror into the twentieth century. How complete was its victory, and how uncompromising its method, is shown by psychology, which, as the latest of the sciences, has taken over the whole of the mechanistic point of view. Not only God but the soul, not only the soul but the mind, not only the mind but consciousness itself, has been swept away by much of the new psychology, and human phenomena reduced to a set of reflex responses to mechanistic impulses. Man like the universe, is a machine. A charge of electricity, applied to a few grains of matter in a test-tube, is all that is left of man who, in the Old Testament, was made by God to be "but a little lower than the angels, and (to be) crowned with glory and honor."

But at the very time when religion, as well as theology, seemed to have been completely and finally routed by science, something unexpectedly happened. Almost without warning, and for reasons which have left the researchers of our time still gasping with amazement, the whole structure of physical science came tumbling to the ground. All these things which seemed to be so certain were certain no more. Realities as hard as steel, as swift as lighting, as sure as gravitation, were suddenly turned as though to flitting shadows. The universe, by the wave of one magician's wand, became, as it were, the abode of relativity. Force, for example! It was no longer a thing in itself. It seemed to have some peculiar relation to matter, to be a form of matter. And grave doubts began to appear of its inexhaustibility. But if force is a form of matter, what is matter? Certainly not, as we had supposed, the impenetrable substance composed of atoms which were themselves indivisible. No, atoms began to yield to radio-activity, and radio-activity to electricity, and electricity to a form of the ether or a thing in the ether, and ether itself to space. So that now we are told that matter is space, and has no reality of its own at all. And as to its indestructibility, that is a myth as foolish as the myth of the Virgin Birth. This brings us to law, the last refuge of a materialistic science, and this also is going. The best scientists of our time are telling us that the reign of law has been dissolved. There is no longer an indissoluble chain of cause and effect. There are effects today which have no adequate causes, and there may well be causes which have no effects. In any case there is no mechanical uniformity which holds the electrons and the stars together like the parts of a vast machine. There is no cosmic mechanism any more. The whole mechanistic or materialistic approach to life is gone, as one of the gigantic illusions, or superstitions, of the human mind. So at least agree two such prominent scientists of our time as Sir Arthur Eddington, greatest of British astronomers, and Sir James Jeans, one of the great mathematical physicists of the modern world. The day of materialism is over, says Professor Eddington. "Materialism and determinism, those household gods of nineteenth century science which believed that the world could be explained in mechanical and biological concepts as a well-run machine, must be discarded." Professor Jeans agrees with this affirmation. "Thirty years ago," he writes, "we thought we were headed toward an ultimate reality of a mechanical kind. (The universe) seemed to consist of a fortuitous jumble of atoms which was destined to perform meaningless dances . . . under the action of blind, purposeless forces, and then fall back to form a dead world. . . . Into this wholly mechanical world, through the play of the same blind forces, life had stumbled by accident." But now all this is gone! "Today," continues Professor Jeans, "there is a wide measure of agreement, which on the physical side approaches almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is leading towards a non-mechanical reality."

Such is the change which has come over science in the last few years. This change is due to the most amazing and revolutionary discoveries that science has ever known. Let it be said, to the everlasting credit of science, that it was science itself that discovered and revealed its own illusions. Materialism is gone—is as dead as Caesar—because the scientists say so! But if materialism is gone, what has come to take its place? This brings us to the third period in the history of the relation between science and religion, into which we are just now moving at the present time. In this period of new discovery, now dawning upon the world, the names of Eddington and Jeans are supreme, at least in England and America. For this reason, and for the further reason that their writings are easily available to the general public, I propose to follow the teachings of these two men in attempting an answer to the question as to what is to be our interpretation of the cosmos in the years to come.

At the start both Eddington and Jeans agree upon a fundamental proposition, that the mechanical conception of the world is yielding to a mathematical conception. Mechanics is giving way to mathematics. "Phenomena," says Eddington, "all boil down to a scheme of symbols, of mathematical equations." Jeans says the same thing. "Our remote ancestors," he writes, "tried to interpret nature in terms of anthropomorphic concepts, and failed. The efforts of our nearest ancestors to interpret nature on mechanical lines proved equally inadequate . . . Pure mathematics has proved brilliantly successful." Einstein also agrees. Those who have seen his note-books, or read his papers,

know that they are all one amazing mass of algebraic equations. The universe, in the last analysis, must be interpreted in terms of mathematical formulae.

But these formulae do not define reality. They only define the relations that exist between the phenomena of reality. What is reality? What are the phenomena of reality in themselves? What is the ultimate from which all things proceed, and to which all things, soonor or later, return? It is in their answers to this most fundamental of all questions that Eddington and Jeans go off in different directions, and yet come in the end to the same conclusion.

Eddington believes that the mathematics of nature can never explain anything. It must ever remain unknown. The final answer of the formulae must always be a cosmic X. He therefore abandons the formulae, and returns to ourselves who have conceived the formulae, and who now ask the question as to what these formulae may mean. It is man, says Eddington, who contains the secret of the world—man with his love of truth, his sense of order, and his responsibility for right. Nature may be expressed in mathematics, but not man who has conceived the science of mathematics to express the correspondence which he finds between the order of nature and the workings of his own mind. It is conceivable that mechanical science might produce in some distant future a robot, "a creature which thinks and believes" and thus may duplicate the mechanical activities of a man's life. But it is not conceivable that such a robot, whatever he thinks and believes, would actually *care* about his thoughts and beliefs. He would never ask if a thing is true, never search for an answer to the question as to why it is true. But it is just this concern for the truth of all we think and say and do, that is central to the life of man as he has sprung from out the world of nature. It is this that makes man to be something wholly apart from all physical phenomena and thus in essence a spiritual reality. "When," says Eddington, "from the human heart the cry goes up, 'What is it all about?' it is no answer to look only at that part of experience which comes to us through certain sensory organs, and say, 'It is about atoms and chaos—a universe of fiery globes, moving to impending doom.' . . . Rather is it about a spirit in which truth has its shrine, with potentialities of self-fulfilment in its responses to beauty and right."

It is in man, therefore, whose genius it is to conceive the very mechanical formulae in which the processes of nature are expressed, that Eddington finds his demonstration of the reality of spirit. From this spiritual essence of man's nature, he moves easily to the spiritual nature of the cosmos itself, which he finds in what religion has known for centuries as God. It is this astronomer, and not a mere theologian of the church, who asserts the existence of God, and he finds this deity to be "Him through whom comes power and goodness." Sir Arthur Eddington, in other words, is a theist—and a theist because he finds it impossible to explain the universe except in terms of spirit.

Professor Jeans, in his search for ultimates, follows another path. Unlike Eddington, this great physicist refuses to abandon the mathematical formulae, of which I have spoken, as a possible interpretation of reality. He insists that in the equations which reveal the relations that exist between phenomena, there may well reside also the revelation of the ultimate which these phenomena express. Certainly there is nothing mechanical in these elaborate symbols. On the contrary, the more Professor Jeans studies these formulae of mathematics, the more he becomes convinced that they represent a mental process. They have come into existence, he contends, not merely because the mind of man has thought them out, but also because they actually exist in the physical processes of the universe. These mathematical equations, in other words, embody what the phenomena of the universe are doing. They are the thought of one who looks upon the cosmos as it moves, and who in himself, of course, is infinitely greater than man who has with such difficulty and in the end so imperfectly discovered some portion of the mathematics of the heavens. "The universe," says Jeans, in one of the most paralyzing statements which has been made by any living man in our time, "the universe begins to look more like a great thought than a great machine. . . . Mind no longer appears as an accidental intruder into the realm of matter. We are beginning to suspect that we ought rather to hail it as the creator and governor of the realm of matter. Not, of course, our individual minds, but the mind in which the atoms, out of which our individual minds have grown, exist as thoughts." From the intrinsic evidence of the universe, in other words, Professor Jeans discovers a creation behind which there must exist a creator, just as behind every thought there must exist a thinker. If, as Jeans states, the universe begins to look like "a great thought," then in and through and behind this universe there is the thinker who has conceived the thought. It is this which brings Jeans to the momentous proclamation that there must exist "a great architect of the universe who is a pure mathematician."

This is God. So far at least as God has been conceived in all ages as a great Mind existing behind reality! But Professor Jeans is not satisfied to conceive of the ultimate merely in terms of a mental concept. The mathematical formulae which hold the mind of this great physicist represent more to him than mere mathematics. "The laws which govern nature," he says, "are less suggestive of those which a machine obeys in its motion than of those which a musician obeys in writing a fugue, or a poet in composing a sonnet. . . . The motions of electrons and atoms do not resemble those of the parts of a locomotive as much as those of dancers in a cotillion." Mathematics, in other words, supplant mechanics only themselves to be supplanted by art and beauty. There is not only thought here in the universe, but emotion and aspiration and high visions of the spirit. Professor Jeans speaks perhaps his noblest word on this phase of the problem when, in a recent letter to the London *Times*, he states that the mathematical formulae which interest him as a physicist appear suddenly before his eyes as "a musical score." He sees in these letters and numerals not merely algebraic equations, but the score of a great symphony, the work of a musician. And when he sees this score, he sees not merely the "framework of scales and key and tune," but also, behind and beyond and above, the surging orchestra with its instruments and music. The workings of the universe, in other words, bring to his ears "the music of the spheres"—which carries us straight back to the teach-

ings of old Pythagoras, who built his universe around the twin poles of mathematics and music. The cosmos, just because it was a mathematical conception, became at the same time the music which produced "celestial harmonies." With the modern theory as with the ancient, God is not only a thinker but a poet, a musician, a spirit that conceives in beauty and attains in song.

Such is the conclusion of these two great scientists of our day as they search the universe for the ultimate expression of its life. What they find is what the religion of every age has found—namely, that the world is spirit, that God is spirit, "that they who worship (God) must worship him in spirit and in truth." The conclusion of all our argument is therefore plain. The answer to our question, "Is science vindicating religion?" is easy. May I summarize the whole trend of all that I have been arguing this morning in three definite propositions:

First, the materialistic, or mechanistic, interpretation of the universe is dead. It has disappeared from the minds of modern men, in all probability never to return.

Secondly, science, in its endeavor to find and formulate the ultimate that lies behind the phenomena of existence, has failed. Science has hoped to match its brilliant success in uncovering facts by an equal brilliant success in uncovering the interpretation of these facts. But in this it has in the end come to nothing. So far as the ultimate interpretation of reality is concerned, science today stands absolutely bankrupt.

Thirdly, in its failure to explain the universe, science must give way to religion. Nay, science is not only giving way to religion, but is supporting it, vindicating it, cooperating with it, in its presentation of spirit as the secret of all life. Where science ends, in other words, religion must now begin. It is in explaining this necessity that Sir Arthur Eddington declares, "This must be done to make room for a spiritual conception of the universe and man's place in it, with religion supplementing that part of the picture which science now must acknowledge itself unable to paint."

It is in the face of these conclusions that I declare that science is today vindicating religion. Alfred Noyes in his great poem, "Watchers of the Sky," tells us the story, when he says:

> Is there no song
> To touch this moving universe of law
> With ultimate light, the glimmer of that great dawn
> Which over our ruined altars yet shall break
> In purer splendor and restore mankind
> From darker dreams than even Lucretius knew
> To vision of that one Power which guides the world?
> How shall men find it? Only through those doors
> Which, opening inward, in each separate soul
> Give each man access to that soul of all
> Living within each life, not to be found
> Or known, till, looking inward each alone
> Meets the unknowable and eternal God.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

[*Concluded*]

A Free American Looks at India

I—Gandhi

"As soon as we have discarded the awe of the British rule and cease to consider ourselves cheap as dirt, we shall be free." These words were spoken by Gandhi. I stood before the jail in Poona where he is a prisoner. The sunset was throwing a glaze of pink light over the somber walls. It was a Sunday afternoon. Poona is outside the high-pressure area of which Bombay is the center. The Mahratti people who live here are rather a luke-warm crowd. Races in India have been divided between fighting races and non-fighting races. Britain has recruited her troops from among the Pathans and the Mahrattis, both fighting races. She has wisely avoided trying to recruit her soldiers among those races which are congenital pacifists. The Mahrattis in Poona do not follow Gandhi. They do a little tepid boycotting of British goods, but they are not keen for civil disobedience. They have been useful for Britain as soldiers. Hence they are bad patriots, but good mercenaries. The general flatness of the Poona situation is depressing to one who comes from the patriotic sparkle of Bombay, where men die before the lathi-charges. During the three weeks I was there three young patriots offered up their lives to British violence, or, as the British would say, they were the victims of unfortunate accident. Babu Gannu died under the wheels of a truck which was deliberately driven over his body by a British police-sergeant. While attending his funeral, young Bajpai had death dealt out to him by the blows of a lathi. Laximidas was unfortunate enough accidentally to get in the way of a volley of bullets fired by the police. To read about such events would not be unattended by pain to civilized people living in New York, Berlin or Paris. To protect them from this unnecessary pain a pure well-spring of truth has been established by the British at Rugby, England. News from India here passes through a filter of moral respectability and is then pumped on without charge to the ultimate consumers. Here is Rugby's official wireless about the murder of Laximidas:

> There were outbreaks of hooliganism and a hostile mob heavily attacked the police picket which was forced to fire and several of the crowd were injured, one dying subsequently.

All this is a part of England's great services to humanity referred to recently by Mr. Winston Churchill when he said: "Gandhism must be crushed." That sounded like the old Latin *"Carthago delenda est."* The British are afraid of poor, weak Gandhi, without a soldier back of him, much as the Romans were afraid of Hannibal. "Gandhi *delendo est.*"

Gandhi's days in prison are spent in the study of the old Hindu religious book called the Bhagavad Gita. His newspaper and press have been confiscated, but he writes a letter once a week, interpreting the message of the Gita, and this letter, received by his friends in the Ashram, is manifolded and sent out by mail to his devoted followers.

Gandhi is by birth a Hindu, and his parent religion was a branch of Hinduism called Vaishnavism, which has for its center the worship of the god Vishnu. Growing up as a boy in Kathiawar, he became exposed to the influence of Jainism, a religion which is paramount in that province. Jainism teaches the doctrine of *ahimsa* or non-killing. The Jains avoid killing even the smallest forms of animal life. Gandhi's contact

with Jainism was later strengthened by contact with Tolstoy, and through him with Christianity. Being a sincere man, whatever Gandhi preached he practiced, and he began to see in Tolstoy's doctrine of passive-resistance a solution for those political struggles which so many times in history have been solved by war and violent revolution. Later on he seems to have come under the influence of the American Thoreau and from him he perhaps caught the now so pregnant phrase of "civil disobedience."

But unquestionably it was from Tolstoy that Gandhi caught the ancient spark of Christianity. Passive-resistance involves two principles, passivity (in the sense of non-violence), and resistance. Hinduism has always been intensely individualistic, and Christianity has always been intensely social. Hinduism has always predisposed its followers to outward passivity, showing a way to the individual, by successive births and by indifference to outward circumstances, to attain to the blessed state of Nirvana. Christianity, while laying emphasis on man's spiritual salvation, was, as to its quintessence, a message of democracy to the masses, a gospel preached unto the poor, a sharing of goods as well as a sharing of death and martyrdom. It came forward with an extremely aggressive economic, social and political program. Under the leadership of that great genius, Paul of Tarsus, it rapidly organized itself into a militant institution which took the name of church, or ecclesia, a name borrowed from the political vocabulary of the Greeks. The church, organized by Paul in the shape of small republics, immediately came into deadly conflict with the then existing Roman State, and thereby showed that its program, while non-violent, was that of "resistance" to all established institutions inconsistent with its own teachings and discipline. It had nothing to do with nationalism, for all nations, colors, languages and creeds came within its bosom. In fact the church resisted nationalism.

While Gandhi calls himself a Hindu, his Hinduism is not orthodox. Shut up in a prison, he turns back with a kind of natural affection to the religion of his childhood, and he seeks there to find a pathway for his people. It is a mark of the depth and sincerity of his character that under long-continued suppression of an extremely brutal character he is with gentleness of spirit ever searching to lead his people into harmony with some eternal, universal religion or principle of truth. It is as a mark of respect for this spiritual fearlessness, this moral uprightness, that his people have given to him, and to him alone, the title of Mahatma, recognizing in him one of those rare and great souls who can never be crushed nor silenced by the powers of this world.

He starts with his native scripture, the Bhagavad Gita, and now he wants, so it would seem, to read into this book the old teachings of the Gospels which in earlier years were revealed to him by Tolstoy. He wants that these two great books shall flow together. He wants that these two great land-marks of human progress shall be joined.

So far as Gandhi is today chiefly interested in "resistance" and less in passivity, his principles are more taken from the Gospels than from the Gita. Through the years he has been growing more and more a champion of the masses. But he remains tied up still in certain fundamental tenets of Hinduism. Believing in the Gita, which he is now preaching, he cannot consistently preach the total abolition of the four castes. He would like perhaps to have the four castes in their purity, (probably at some former time they had a good *raison-d'etre*), allowing members of different castes to eat with each other and to intermarry with each other, and of course doing away with the curse of untouchability. But yet the Gospels can know nothing of class or caste. There seems to be here an irreconcilable difference between the Christian system and the Hindu system. Which current of thought will finally gain the victory in Gandhi's mind?

"As soon as we have discarded the awe of the British rule and cease to consider ourselves as cheap as dirt, we shall be free," said Gandhi. I have been over a large part of India and I am convinced of the extraordinary intelligence and will power of her people. I doubt if any other people in the world have today as much power to "carry on" as these people have. They are behind the west in only one respect. They do not seem to be convinced on the question of social equality. I doubt very much if the British ever would have been able to hold one inch of Indian soil, had the Indians in the beginning been penetrated with the spirit of social equality. Mentality being as it is in India, what is the outlook for social equality? How can the idea of social equality be put into people who have been taught to believe that they have been born into castes? The Brahmin looks upon the untouchable as "cheap as dirt" and Brahminism is the very apex of the Hindu system.

EDWARD HOLTON JAMES

Song for Friendship

I love you, O friend, because you have given my heart
a new song—
When I was discouraged, a fresh impulse to try again.
When doubtful, a new vision of truth and victorious faith.
When lonely, you invited guests—the great souls,
And made fragrant, immortal friendships.

I love you, O friend, because you have opened my eyes to
enduring values;
Awakened my giant self—my divine self within me.
Because, in the garden of my thoughts,
You often have uprooted a thistle
And planted in its place a hyacinth.

I love you, O friend, because you have inspired in me
The flaming, unquenchable desire
To rise and walk out to meet Truth and Beauty
Fearless and unencumbered.

CHARLOTTE CONKRIGHT KINNEY

Waste of War

Deep within me
Resentment
Flashes into anger,
For the needless waste of war—
War that wastes courage,
As men waste water
When there is plentiful rain,
War that wastes beauty, the companion of all joy,
War that offers man's own body as stop for cannon balls—
And man himself is sponsor
For the needless waste of war—
Life,
Most precious of all the treasures known on earth,
Held cheapest of them all,
That some man's greed
May overtop his neighbor's;
Greed that kindles greed
Till greed has seared the earth.

MARTHA LINSLEY SPENCER

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[*Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day" here published for the first time in English*]

LXX

1.

There was once a feeble-minded woman, who became blind as a result of disease, but could never understand that she was blind. She would grow angry because, no matter where she went, everything would get in her way and push her. She thought that things pushed her, not that she bumped into them.

And it is just so when people are blind to the spiritual life. It seems to them that everything that happens to them is done on purpose to irritate. They get angry at people and do not understand that, like the feeble-minded woman, they are unhappy—not because others make them so—but because they are blind to the spiritual life, and live for the body.

2.

If you have been angry at a man, this means that you were leading—not a divine—but a physical life. If you lead a divine life, no one can offend you, because God cannot be offended; and God, that God who is within you, cannot be angry.

3.

You must not rage at people or at animals. It is worse to rage at animals, for a man can understand what you want, while an animal cannot, and still you rage at it.

4.

The more superior a man considers himself, the more easily he harbors ill-feeling toward others. The more humble a man is, the kinder he is, and the less is he moved to anger.

5.

To make our relations with men always joyful, we must remember, when we meet with them, that the necessary and important thing is not what *I* need, and not what *that man* needs with whom I have to do, but what *that God* who dwells in both of us, needs from us both.

Just remember this when you have an unpleasant feeling toward people, and it will pass off immediately.

LXXI

1.

A man knows that he is leading a bad life, but instead of changing it for the better, he tries to assure himself that he is not a man like other men, but superior to them, and therefore that he ought to live just as he is living. Hence it comes about that if men lead a bad life, they are also proud.

2.

A child treats a king and a worker alike. We should learn from children how to treat people. To a child all men are equal, and they should be to a Christian.

3.

A man can only consider himself better than others when he leads a physical life. Only a body can be stronger, bigger, better than other bodies. If a man leads a spiritual life he cannot consider himself better than others, for the spirit is one and the same in all.

4.

There cannot be pride without stupidity. Stupidity can exist even without pride, but without stupidity there can be no pride.

5.

A man who understands the meaning and the mission of life cannot help feeling his equality and brotherhood not only with men of his own nation, but with men of all nations.

At the siege of Sebastopol, I often saw how Russian and French soldiers, during a truce, would get together, and, not understanding a word of each other's language, would still smile in friendly fashion, make signs and pat one another on the shoulder or the belly. How far superior these men were, to those who brought about the war and made people believe that they were not brothers, not people of the same sort, but enemies —because they belonged to different nations.

6.

The main cause of our dissatisfaction with life is that we fail to seek felicity where it is given us. This is the substance of all snares. We are given the incomparable felicity of life, with all its joys, and we say "There are too few joys." We are given the supreme joy of life, intercourse with the people of the world, and we say "I want a separate felicity of my own for myself, my family and my nation."

7.

It is amusing to watch two proud men, each of whom considers himself superior to everyone on earth, when they come together. To the onlooker this is amusing, but for the two proud men it is not amusing. They are hating each other, and this torments them.

8.

Nothing gives such assurance in evil-doing as fellowship, that is the recognition of a certain circle separate from other men. And what is most amazing of all is that this evil feeling of settling oneself apart from all men is considered a virtue.

LXXII

1.

People make fun, as they always have, of him who sits in silence, they make fun of him who talks much, and of him who talks little; there is nothing and no one on earth that they do not blame. There never was, nor will be, nor is there anyone who is always blamed in everything; just as there is no one who is always praised in everything. And therefore it is not worth while to care either about the praise or the blame of men.

2.

Unhappy is he who lives—not according to his conscience—but only that men should praise him.

3.

"Heaven is indignant at us for our sins, and earth —for our virtues." Before God we are in fault for our sins, but men for the most part consider us in fault and blame us for that in us which is good, but not in harmony with the life of the majority.

4.

We should train ourselves to live quite without thought of human opinion, even without desire for human love, but only for the fulfilment of the law of life, of the will of God. To be sure, in such a solitary life, alone with God, the desire for human glory, which sometimes spurs us on to good deeds, is lost; but such freedom, tranquility, constancy and such a steadfast consciousness of the right way are gained,

as he who lives for human glory shall never experience. And it is possible to train ourselves to this.

5.

Only allow yourself to descend from the height on which you live for the soul, and at once you fall into a pitiable concern for human glory. But this life for human glory is not the last stage of the fall of man. After becoming indifferent to human glory, you descend still lower into the region of mere animal passions.

6.

Vanity is the first and crudest instrument of perfection against animal lust. But afterwards you must cure yourself of the medicine. There is only one treatment—to live for the soul.

LXXIII

1.

Men say that it is permissible to return evil for evil in order to reform people. This is untrue. People deceive both themselves and others when they think and say so. They repay evil with evil, not to reform others, but to revenge themselves. You cannot reform evil by doing evil.

2.

If by force I can make a man do what I consider good, then in just the same way, another man can make me do by force what he considers good, although what he considers good and what I consider good may be quite contrary to each other.

3.

We must know and remember that a desire to punish is a desire for revenge, and is not proper to man as a rational creature, but only to the animal nature of man. Hence man must seek to free himself from this feeling, and in no way to justify it.

4.

If only we were not taught from childhood that to repay evil with evil is beneficial for those to whom we do evil, we should feel nothing but amazement when people teach others, as if on purpose to corrupt them, that punishment can be of benefit. We punish a child to break his habit of wrong-doing, but by this very punishment we teach him in the most real way to believe that punishment may be just and benficial. And it is not likely that any of those wrong tendencies for which we punish him, could be so harmful to him as the wrong tendency that we suggest to him by our punishment. "They punish me, hurt me, because I hurt someone else, therefore to punish—to repay evil with evil—is good," says the child to himself. And at the first opportunity he puts this into practice.

5.

Our life would become beautiful, if only we saw what interferes with our happiness. And what interferes most of all with our happiness is the superstition that violence can give happiness.

6.

Prisons, convict stations, penal servitude are institutions that seem to have been invented on purpose to produce such highly concentrated vice and corruption, as could be attained under no other conditions. It is as if the founders of these institutions wanted to spread this concentrated vice and corruption on the very widest scale throughout all the people; as if they had set themselves the task of corrupting as many people as possible in the best and surest manner. Every year hundreds of thousands are brought to the highest degree of corruption, and having been entirely corrupted, they are set free as if for the purpose of spreading what they acquired in prison throughout all the people. Ordinary, simple men with the demands of a simple, social, Christian morality, depart from these conceptions and acquire the new conceptions of the prison, which consist chiefly of this: that any outrage, any violation of human personality, any destruction of it, is permissible when advantageous. People who have lived in prison learn with all their being that, if they judge by what is done to them, all those moral laws of respect and sympathy between man and man, that are preached by church and moral teachers, have actually been annulled; and that they should not keep them.

7.

If we admit the inadmissible — that man has the right to punish—then who amongst men will take this right upon himself? Only those who have fallen so low that they neither remember nor know their own sins.

8.

True kindness is not only a virtue and a joy, but a weapon far mightier than violence.

(*To be Continued*)

The Study Table

An Able Work on India

In this work* the author, an American journalist, who lived in India for several years and had the opportunity of mixing with British officials, Indian Princes and Indian people of all classes, shows an unusual understanding and appreciation of the real India—her religion, social system, art, music and culture. The author's style is charming, and her descriptive power fascinates one who wishes to visualize India in her sublime, delicate and gorgeous beauty. The interpretation of historical background of Indian culture with its spirit of toleration and spiritual outlook of life has been very cleverly and effectively presented through simple narratives. It is a penetrating study of India as a whole.

To the author, things political seem less important than the cultural and spiritual life of the people. However, she recognizes the fact that economics and politics, indirectly but very seriously, affect the cultural existence of a nation. Therefore, she has been forced to discuss certain phases of Indian political and economic problems. It should be noted that the author went to India as a believer in British rule in India and its "sacred mission," but she had to change her views on the subject. (p. 30.)

In the discussions of Indian political and economic problems, this book supplies much worthwhile, unbiased and authoritative information about the nature of British rule and British officials in India, Indian Native States and their rulers. From her wide experience and personal contacts, the author has come to the conclusion that British officials in India may be efficient in their routine work, writing reports, but they are ignorant of India and her people and their needs. They

*The Power of India, by Michael Pym. Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. $3.50.

invariably act with certain pre-conceived and false notions. While they talk much about protecting the people of India from misery and civil wars, they have no genuine interest in the real welfare of the country. They go there for careers and positions. Those among them who show any interest in Indian life and welfare, are classed as "cranks;" and they never get a chance to do something effective.

The author asserts that the average British official —members of Indian Civil Service, Army, Police, etc. —is not a man of culture and breadth of vision. It is a pure myth that he is superior to the average Indian official. Of course, there are honorable exceptions among British officials; for instance, the author thinks that Lord Irwin, the present Viceroy of India, is a man of great spirituality and sincerity.

The author proves conclusively, and with documentary evidence, that since the days of the East India Company, Great Britain has been following a policy of merciless exploitation of India which has led to the destruction of her fine arts, industry and national prosperity. The author points out that India used to export salt; but India's salt industry in the Native States was destroyed by British policy.

> What seems, in view of everything, to add insult to injury, is that India consumes about two and a half million tons of salt a year, and *while all these salt manufactories are shut down,* six hundred thousand tons of India's two and a half million have to be imported from Europe! (p. 81.)

The chapters dealing with the Indian princes and their relations with the British Government disclose certain facts which demonstrate that the Government violated treaties, contracts and solemn agreements to annex territories and to extract cash from Indian princes. She levels her attack on the officials of the Political Department of the Government of India, who "carry out almost iniquitous deeds from the point of view of ethics, without one small shudder." (p. 274.) It is rather refreshing to read intimate and unchallengable facts which prove that Indian administrators in important states of Hydrabad, Mysore and others, in spite of serious limitations of freedom of action which is imposed by "British Paramountcy," have done more for education, sanitation and real welfare of the people than the British have done in British India.

What is meant by British paramountcy over Indian States? It may be explained from the existing relations of Mysore, one of the major States of India with the British Government.

> Theoretically, Mysore is a major state, actually, the Maharaja can do very little without British sanction. Succession to the throne is regulated by the British; the military organization of the State, its enlistment, equipment, etc., are fixed and directed by the British; the telegraph is part of British system; British laws and regulations instituted during the British jurisdiction must be continued. The Maharaja may not employ in his service any person not a native of India, except with express permission; manufacturing salt and opium and the cultivation of the white poppy may be prohibited or limited by the British, and any regulations they think fit regarding their export and import enforced; the rule must, at all times, conform to such advice as the Governor General in Council may give him with a view to the management of his finances, settlement, and collection of revenues, imposition of taxes, administration of justice, extension of commerce, or anything else connected with his administration. (p. 107.)

Because of these limitations over sovereignty, Indian Nationalists justly class the Indian princes as mere "puppets." Indian princes also resent these limitations, confirmed by the reports of the Butler commission and the Simon Commission.

However, the people of Indian Native States are economically better off and they have preserved India's art, music and traditions. It is rather interesting to note that the author, through her intimate social contacts with important personages in Indian States, foresaw long before the convening of the Round Table Conference on India, that Indian princes will favor an All-Indian Federation to preserve their interests and to help unify India. In this respect she possessed more accurate information on the subject than the officials in British India and India Office in London.

Nowadays much is talked about India's inability to assume the responsibility of national defense. It may be interesting to note the author's views on the subject:

> The army in India is divided into a Field Army, organized for foreign service, in which the proportion of British troops is about one to three; *a Covering Army which is almost wholly Indian, to keep order on the Frontier;* and an Internal Security Force, really for the protection of British in India, which is largely made up of British troops. *There are about seven thousand officers, and sixty-one thousand and five hundred British troops, the heaviest item of the military budget. Analysed, therefore, the British army in India does become an army of occupation.* When the Swarajists complain, they are thinking of this. When the British talk about defence of the Frontier, as a motive for British occupation of India, Swarajists laugh sarcastically because they think that anyhow Indian troops are already taking care of that, *and all they need is more Indian officers.* Again, changes in this direction could not be achieved instantly. At present ten Indians [are permitted] a year pass through Sandhurst and receive King's Commissions. The Indian Sandhurst Committee under General Skeen unanimously recommended a scheme which would Indianize fifty per cent of the officers somewhere around 1953, but no action has yet been taken on this. *No Indians serve as gunners in the Artillery, there are none in the Tank Corps, and no Indian units or training of any kind for Indians, in the Air Force.* When the British suggest that India connot defend herself, they are perfectly right. When the Swarajists swear at the British, and ask what the Internal Security Force is for, if not an army of occupation, and whether the Field Army is to serve India or the Empire for foreign service, they are also perfectly right. (p. 293.)

Therefore, it is sufficient to say that British military policy in India has been to keep the people unarmed and defenseless and to enforce subjection through an army of occupation. Indian nationalities will never be satisfied until they secure control over the national defense of the country and the British army of occupation leaves India.

Her discussions on the intimate life of Indian women, derived from living in Indian homes, their influence in all progressive movements (social and political), are not only accurate but instructive. Some of the facts on these subjects will be revelations to many of the West who have no conception of true life of the Indian people. The author most effectively controverts some of the most mischievous statements of Miss Mayo made in her book "Mother India," regarding Indian women and Indian life.

The author shows considerable knowledge about the growth of the Indian Nationalist Movement and activities of Indian extremists. It is a pity that Mrs. Pym has made a false estimate of Mahatma Gandhi. During an interview, she was not at all impressed with him as a great spiritual leader. She regards him to be a politician who is anxious to have "power." She characterizes Gandhi as

> the ugly, little Tolstoyan poseur, self-conscious, shifty, destructive, unpleasantly unctuous, yet imposing himself as a sort of

saint upon thousands of people in the West who don't know him, because he personifies the elements that made Christianity —at the expense of Christ. (p. 266.)

The author is free to record her own impressions of Gandhi, as she sees him; but one cannot but feel that she is prejudiced. Gandhi has at no time claimed to be a saint, nor has he ever imposed his personality upon the western people who do not know him. It is a fact that hundreds of western people, including some British officials, who know him, have felt his spiritual power and have acclaimed him to be the greatest living religious teacher. Whatever may be the quality of saintliness of Gandhi, there is not the least doubt that *he is the greatest man in the world today.* He is being followed by millions of Indians from all classes and religions. He has been able to rouse the masses of India to demand freedom for their country and to suffer for the achievement of this ideal. Even Gandhi's enemies cannot but recognize his greatness.

The author's analysis of the present unrest in India is interesting. It is not merely agitation for political freedom, but has a greater world significance. She writes:

India is changing but that very change, one saw, unlike that of other countries, was not towards westernization *but to re-assertion of India-ness.* The conflict, I understood clearly enough, was one of ideals. Others had seen that too. Superficial observers termed it the conflict of Hinduism with—they dare no longer say Christianity—with Western Progress. Western enlightenment, Western ideals. But it was not Hinduism. These people were quite wrong. It was much stronger, something that has since the dawn of history shaped, influenced, and even at times inspired, Hinduism, the early religions of Egypt, Buddhism, Eastern Christianity, even in some ways, Islam. It was that which produced so many great teachers, pointing the way to reality. *"That"* was flaming up again in India. . . . India will win. Matter is always moulded by spirit. The immediate conflict is, you see now, of importance only in so far as it may creat personal bitterness and fear between races. It will deside, perhaps in the next few years whether India shall retain its immemorial role of interpreter between East and West, of cultural fountain for both East and West, or whether, in spite of itself, it is to be driven into the slowly forming alliance of East against West. . . . India will never be an aggressive political power except at the expense of all its traditions, all its spiritual force. . . ." (pp. 299-306.)

In spite of a few minor inaccuracies of dates and facts about the Indian nationalist movement, the book is valuable. It gives rare insight into the true spirit of India in which lies the real power of India which is a living force. The book should be carefully studied by all, especially English and American peoples, who wish to understand India.

TARAKNATH DAS.

Correspondence

Is Wealth Sharing Unemployment Burden?

Editor of UNITY:

A great amount of relief work in one form or another is being carried on over the country, and it would be a matter of public interest if we could know who is bearing the burden of it. When we read in February that 25 car loads of foodstuffs, mostly farm products, were being cleared daily through the Red Cross branch at St. Louis, it was apparent that the farmers of the more favored regions were doing their part.

From all accounts, the workingmen are doing theirs. Professor S. H. Slichter of Harvard told us in the *New Republic* a few weeks ago of railroad shops on the Baltimore & Ohio, the Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville, and other roads, in which, for months, men had voluntarily been working five days a week instead of six in order to provide jobs for other workers. Also that many locals of the Typographical Union had limited their members to five days' work a week for a similar reason. In Oshkosh, Wisconsin, a group of city employees had temporarily "loaned" their jobs to needy unemployed persons.

This staggering of work in order to provide jobs for more people has become quite general over the country, though it is usually done, I believe, on the initiative of the management rather than of the employees. This is doubtless true also where the shorter work day is being adopted. If Professor Slichter is correct these plans do not as a rule involve any loss to the employers; the workers simply give up part of their work and wages, whether voluntary or not, for the benefit of the needy unemployed.

Corporation employees who make their contributions in cash usually donate a definite percentage of their wages, one or two days' pay a month. An occasional employer (the Inland Steel Company for example) has agreed to match the contributions of its employees. But Professor Slichter reaches the conclusion that "the most generous contributions seem to come from the less well-to-do rather than from the more wealthy."

The Chicago correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor* declared recently that the wage earners there had "set an example of generosity in subscribing to the $5,000,000 unemployment relief fund." Mr. Ben F. McCutcheon, a Chicago business man who was devoting full time service to the drive, was quoted to the effect that some 135,000 men and women of moderate means had made contributions up to the early part of February. He added: "If the men of wealth, as a group, would respond as wholeheartedly as their employees, the fund would have been oversubscribed weeks ago. The commission has hit a snag, however, in its efforts to persuade persons of large incomes to subscribe proportionately."

At Washington, as will be recalled, the effort to have persons of large incomes contribute to a $25,000,000 "food" appropriation also "hit a snag." Our government, which had handed out subsidies to ship owners, tariff largesses to manufacturers, monopoly privileges to utility corporations and very lucrative contracts to air-mail companies, was alarmed lest a "dangerous precedent" would be established by providing food for starving citizens—citizens who in time of danger stood ready to defend their country with their lives!

If this incomplete survey justifies any conclusion, it is that our vested interests have retarded industrial recovery by leaving the burden of unemployment and drouth relief to be borne too largely by the less well-to-do classes—the very classes that were expected to bring back prosperity by increasing their purchases of goods. This is not denying the noble part that many wealthy citizens have borne in the relief work.

They should welcome a system that would compel all wealth to share the burden of relief work equitably. Especially so if the relief plan looked toward the stabilization of industrial employment. This is the view of those who advocate unemployment insurance, with the cost assessed largely against incomes and inheritances (including incomes of the workers themselves). They believe the effect would be to stabilize industry by maintaining a steadier purchasing power for the masses.

As the idea of unemployment insurance is new to many, it may be well to explain that it does not contemplate benefits equal to what could be earned through steady employment; but the benefits would be paid in proportion to earning power, as shown by the record of previous employment. The incompetents and those who refuse jobs and those who lose jobs through a fault of their own would fare poorly. Thus no encouragement would be given the slacker.

This is the system in use in Germany, and I believe it is embodied in most of the bills under consideration in our legislatures. In the present stage of our social development it is perhaps the only workable plan. For one, I have never believed that equality of opportunity requires equality of incomes; but we can all agree that we should be moving in that direction rather than the opposite.

F. S. KINDER

Denver, Colo.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 82)

Mexico to be held in Mexico City, July 4-24, 1931.

Program

The program of the Seminar in Mexico extends over a period of three weeks, and is three-fold in scope:

First, the morning conferences. These are planned to furnish a comprehensive survey of the Mexican scene: political, economic, religious, cultural, racial. The addresses serve as an introduction to Mexican life. The majority of the speakers are Mexicans, outstanding in their various interests, members of the Mexican government, professors in the National University, economists, bankers, experts on agrarian developments, education, oil laws, the church, labor, the arts, etc. Among those who have participated during the past five years have been President Plutarco Elias Calles, President Portes Gil, President Ortiz Rubio, Dr. Moisés Sáenz, Mr. Aarón Sáenz, Justice Salvador Urbina, Mr. Luis Morones, Mr. Diego Rivera, Mr. Carlos Merida, and Count René d'Harnoncourt. There are also speakers from the United States. During the past five years these have included Ambassador Dwight W. Morrow, Dr. J. Fred Rippy, Mr. Paul U. Kellogg, Judge Florence E. Allen, Mrs. Mary Austin, and others.

Second, the Round Tables. The round tables afford opportunity, under the leadership of recognized authorities in their respective fields, for the critical analysis of the material presented in the larger conferences, and the frank discussion of controversial questions. Eight sessions will be held of each round table group. These sessions are scheduled for the period 4:00 to 6:00 each day. Each member will enroll for one round table but will have the privilege of visiting other sessions. Many Mexicans join us for these round table discussions.

The list of leaders of round tables for the Sixth Seminar in Mexico includes Judge Florence Allen of the Supreme Court of Ohio, Mr. Carleton Beals, author of "Mexico: An Interpretation," etc., Professor Charles W. Hackett of the University of Texas, Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, author of many books on Latin America, Dr. Eyler Simpson of the Institute of Current World Affairs, Dr. Frank Tannenbaum, author of "The Mexican Agrarian Revolution," Rev. R. A. McGowan of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and Mr. Morris Topchevsky.

The subjects for the round tables are tentative, but it is expected that the following will be scheduled:

I. **The Arts and Crafts of Mexico.** This program will include addresses by the outstanding artists of Mexico, visits to their studios, and to churches, museums, etc. This feature of the program is of especial interest because of the significant work which is being done by the artists of Mexico—Diego Rivera, Clemente Orozco and others.

II. **Mexico and the United States.** Leader, Judge Florence Allen. A study of some of the points of international strain: the Monroe Doctrine, international debts, immigration, international claims, recognition, intervention, etc.

III. **The New Education in Mexico.** A study of the program of Mexican education. Dr. John Dewey describes this as "in some respects one of the most important social experiments undertaken anywhere in the world." Address by Mexican educators. Visits to city and village schools.

IV. **Central American Problems.** A discussion of the present status of our relations with Nicaragua, Guatemala, Costa Rica, etc. This round table will be of particular value to those who plan to take the special field trip to Nicaragua, mentioned in another paragraph.

V. **Industry and Labor in Mexico.** Leader, Dr. Frank Tannenbaum. A discussion of the industrial resources, possibilities and problems of Mexico. The fundamental industries of Mexico—agriculture, mining, textiles, railroads and oil—will be discussed both from the point of view of national and of international economy.

VI. **The History of Mexico.** Leader, Professor Charles W. Hackett. A resume of the history of Mexico will be given in a special series of lectures. It is probable that this course will be given at a different hour from the round tables so that all who wish may attend.

VII. **The Flora and Fauna of Mexico.** The leader will be a Mexican scientist. The program will include field trips into the country. Within fifty miles of Mexico City it is possible to study the semitropical as well as the temperate zones of flora and fauna. A trip will also be made into the tropics if the members of the group so elect.

VIII. **Social Forces in Mexico.** The present status of public health, penology, the regulation of alcohol, child welfare, etc.

For details regarding field trips, former seminars, membership conditions and expense see next issue of UNITY.

Note

The article by Mrs. Felix Adler in memory of the late Anna Garlin Spencer, published in this Department of UNITY on March 30th, was taken from the Ethical Culture *Standard*. By an oversight this fact was not mentioned.

EINSTEIN SAYS

The way to abolish war is to declare in peace time your refusal to give service in war time.

If you agree with him, enroll with

WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE

171 West 12th St., New York City

Phone Oakland 0489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in

HARDWARE

AT

JOHNSON'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The

Oakland :: Press

GOOD PRINTING

Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.

3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.

PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

The Twelve Greatest Women

A jury of five men have presumed to select "the twelve greatest women in America." Says a critic: "All lovely ladies, and no doubt kind to flowers."

Why do these male judges omit a woman who is so great in the cause of social justice that she is hailed as "World Mother" in Europe as well as in America?

Felix Salten, author of "Bambi," wrote recently in the "Neue Freie Presse" of Vienna: "In Altadena, California, lives a woman, Mrs. Kate Crane-Gartz. . . . . One feels a joyful confidence because there is in America such a nature as this, a WORLD MOTHER."

Rob Wagner, in his lively journal, "Script", says: "There she is, looking out over a suffering world with the eyes of a mother—beautiful eyes, in a beautiful, smiling face. . . . Using the economic status great wealth gives her, she goes right after the leaders of her opposition."

Read the indictment of poverty, unemployment, and war in

STILL MORE LETTERS

the sixth volume of Kate Crane-Gartz, and guess why five men on a jury prefer ladies who are "kind to flowers."

Price, $1 cloth; 50 cents paper

Mary Craig Sinclair
Pasadena, California